



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,443	05/25/2001	Kelly Gravelle	111039.00216	2653

27557 7590 04/27/2006

BLANK ROME LLP
600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

FADOK, MARK A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/864,443	Applicant(s) GRAVELLE, KELLY	
	Examiner Mark Fadok	Art Unit 3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to affirmed Examiner's answer mailed 11/29/2005, which was received 1/30/2006. The applicant's amendment has been carefully considered and was found to be persuasive, however, after further searching the following rejection modified as necessitated by amendment follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall et al. (6,026,375), and further in view of Kuykendall.

In regards to claims 1-31, Hall teaches all the claimed features related to a mobile ordering system that schedules an order over the Internet and allows payment of same for pickup at a prescribed time, but does not specifically mention the features related to the use of a wireless tag. Kuykendall teaches a system that allows a McDonalds customer to pay using California's Fastrak toll- payment transponders. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the wireless tags as a

payment/arrival indicator as taught by Kuykendall, because this would increase the speed of delivery at the point of pickup.

The combination of Hall and Kuykendall teaches all the features of the instant claims with the exception of using the RF tag to place the customer in a que at the restaurant. Elliott teaches using an RF transponder to locate a vehicle in a line and provide information regarding where in the que the customer's vehicle is in relation to other. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Hall/Kuykendall the queuing using an RF tag because this will prevent confusion by providing a means by which each vehicle is associated with each item delivered regardless of whether or not the RF tag is used of the conventional order window (Elliott col 4, lines 45-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elliott (US 6366220).

In regards to claims 1-31, Elliott teaches all the elements of the instant invention. For instance, Elliott discloses a system and method are provided that allow a customer to order drive-through menu items using an RF tag (104). A customer vehicle (102) is equipped with a radio-frequency RF tag (104). Prior to placing an order, the customer opens an account and creates a default menu using a food vendor's web site. To order

items from the default menu, the customer approaches a drive-through order station (312) at a fast food vendor location (318). As vehicle 102 passes order station (312) a first transponder (110A) queries RF tag (104) and processes a return signal (114). Identification information is extracted from return signal (114) such that the customer's order, consisting of the default menu items, is prepared. The customer's vehicle 102 then approaches pick-up station (316) and a second transponder (110B) queries RF tag (104) and subsequently bills the customer's account for the ordered items.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3625

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **receptionist** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3600**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 [Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

"Box AF"]

(571) 273-6755 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]



Mark Fadok

Primary Examiner